DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 760 PL 009 816

AUTHOR Petersen, P. W.
TITLE The Misuses and Dangers of Literary Dialect as Linguistic Data. Papers in Linguistics: 1974-1977: A Collection of M.A. Papers from Students in the Linguistics Department of Northeastern Illinois University.
INSTITUTION Northeastern Illinois Univ., Chicago. Dept. of Linguistics.
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Dialects; *Black Literature; Creoles; Dialect Studies; Language Research; Language Styles; *Language Usage; *Language Variation; *Linguistic Theory; Literary Analysis; *Literary Criticism; Negative Forms (Language); Novels; Sociolinguistics; Syntax; Verbs
IDENTIFIERS Bailey (Beryl Loftman); Miller (Warren)

ABSTRACT

The dangers and misuses of literary dialect as a source of information for linguistic evaluation are analyzed. "Literary dialect" is used to refer to writing in which the main purpose is the artful construction of a narrative, where the dialect representation is apt to be concerned more with giving an artful impression of a dialect than with giving an accurate rendering. Data from a linguistic paper, "Toward a New Perspective in Negro English Dialectology"(1965), by Beryl Loftman Bailey, are criticized. The paper uses Warren Miller's novel, "The Cool World," a novel written in literary dialect, as data in concluding that black and white Southern speech differs significantly because the speech of blacks has its origins in a "proto-creole" grammatical structure. Important aspects of a linquistic evaluation of literary dialect are discussed. Since Bailey's argument for black-white speech differences centers on verb usages, particularly the verb "be," the frequencies of "is/are" occurrence in "The Cool World" are compared with frequencies found in a study by Wolfram (1971) based on live informants. Four other items that are considered in criticizing the accuracy of the novel are multiple negativization, embedded yes-no questions, embedded Wh-questions, and optional "do support" (insertion of the verb "do" in a sentence). (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE MISUSES AND DANGERS OF LITERARY DIALECT AS LINGUISTIC DATA--P.W. Petersen

ED163760

I: Introduction

Certainly any scientist in forming hypotheses will want to work with data that is as adequate as possible, and though the data in linguistics may frequently prove to be elusive, there are clearly areas where a good initial assessment of the source should lead to a rejection of it, particularly if more adequate data can be acquired elsewhere. Of course, if the total data available proves to be sparse, there will be no choice but to work with what there is.

One such area in linguistics is the historical development of pidgins, creoles, and Black English,[1] where aspects of these languages have survived in written records. Though these sometimes are limited to fragments of questionable accuracy, there has been a wide diversity of documents examined that displays the diligence and cleverness of Black English researchers. Thus it is not uncommon in reading papers by creolists such as William A. Stewart, J.L. Dillard, and David Dalby to find references to data as diverse as court transcripts, song collections, collected folklore, histories, chronicles, archives, journals, diaries, nautical manuals, and prescriptive grammars for colonials. By way of examples, the many documents referred to in creolist studies include the 16th century nautical manual of a French mariner; some 17th century Black English attestations in Commonwealth History of Massachusetts; the 18th century diary of a native African trader, written in Black English; and a 19th century collection of Western Union telegrams in California frontier pidgin English. Aside from the fascination and delight that such historical investigations may provide for a reader, a main justification for using such data is obvious -- it is all that is available. Informants have long been dead.

But in studying current forms of a language or a particular dialect, that justification is no longer present. The informants may be reluctant to accommodate the linguist; seeking out and working with informants may require much effort; and there certainly are many subtle and debatable problems in data gathering, including what Labov calls the "observer's paradox."[2] A temptation thus exists to avoid live data gathering and rather to choose easily available written sources, a type of data furthermore suggested and possibly supported by the practice in historical reconstructions. But in choosing such secondary sources over live informants, a high premium is placed on the reliability of the written source. That is not to say that the use of data from written documents can be justified only for historical forms,[3] but a present-day written source can be more critically assessed not just against other written documents but also against data from living informants. Unlike obsolete language forms, present-day speakers of Black English do exist. The informants are alive.

FL009816

In thus critically assessing contemporary documents that represent contemporary language usage, there is an additional large source of written material that merits especial attention: literary dialect. While many of the above-mentioned types of sources could also be described as literary dialect, the term is here used particularly to refer to writing where the author's main purpose is aesthetic, that is, the artful construction of a narrative, and where the author's dialect representation is apt to be more concerned with giving an artful impression of a dialect than an accurate rendering. Though many examples of literary dialect have been argued to be quite accurate,[4] the additional aesthetic dimension should cause a linguist to be especially critical of literary dialect sources.

It would seem well, then, for linguists to guard against the misuse and dangers of using written sources for their data, and literary dialect sources in particular. Assessing the reliability of written sources should in most

cases include comparative use of other information when available: other written document sources, live informants, other linguistic studies of the area in question, and external evidence about the author and how the document came to be written. But in reality, such critical assessment may not be performed, and it is the purpose of this paper to elucidate upon the danger and misuse of literary dialect as data by arguing that at least one well-known and respected linguist made an unfortunate choice of an inadequate, inaccurate example of literary dialect for her data -- a choice that has apparently gone unquestioned and become perpetuated in the linguistic literature. The data under indictment here is Warren Miller's novel The Cool World (1959), and the linguistic paper is Beryl Loftman Bailey's now well-known, well-anthologized, and often-cited "Toward a New Perspective in Negro English Dialectology" (1965).

II: Bailey's Study

In her "New Perspective" article, Beryl Bailey uses The Cool World, a novel written in literary dialect, as her data in concluding that black speech and white speech of the South differ significantly because the speech of blacks has its origins in a "Proto-Creole grammatical structure" (1965:172). Wolfram and Clarke point out that disputes among linguists over black-white speech relationships in America have had a long history (1971:ix). They put Bailey's article into perspective and hint at its importance when they say that Bailey's conclusion in this article, together with similar conclusions by William A. Stewart,[5] was responsible for reviving some of these disputes in the 1960's, giving, in particular, renewed attention to the creole-origins theory of black American speech (1971:xi). This attention to possible creole origins has undoubtedly been important; however, what is being criticized here is not any general conclusion about creole-origins, but rather Bailey's particular conclusion based on data from a literary dialect source that I will show is unreliable.

Regardless of the depth to which a study goes, we should be able to expect a linguist to choose reliable data - both for a comprehensive study and for an initial, exploratory study. In this regard it should be pointed out that Bailey's article did not claim to represent a thorough study. This can be seen in her calling her conclusion a "suggestion," and also by her several apologies for choosing The Cool World, saying that her investigations are in the initial stages; admitting that such a choice of literary text would not usually be accepted as good; and surmising that she "may be overlooking some crucial facts which only a native speaker can elucidate" (1965: 173). One purpose of her paper, in fact, was to encourage linguists to do thorough investigations, going deeper than what she calls her own "excursion into a literary text" (1965:177). But to say that using literary texts "is not generally accepted as good linguistic procedure" (1965:173), and to use a literary text anyway, suggests that not enough may be known about why and in what ways literary dialect can be unreliable. Furthermore, that an article is merely exploratory and suggestive should not excuse a linguist from the responsibility of choosing reliable data.

Bailey's choice of The Cool World (hereafter TCW) is not all a matter of expediency and apology, for she also gives serious reasons for her choice of TCW. Assuming that a dialect writer will overload the text with the most distinctive features of a dialect,[6] Bailey believes that this dialect writer will produce a body of data from which a "hypothetical dialect" can easily be "abstracted." In other words, she is searching in TCW for "some Proto-Creole grammatical structure" in Black English basilect[7] (172 & 173). By several different comments in her paper, Bailey strongly implies that the language of TCW contains the basilect and creole ancestor of what we here refer to as BEV. For example, she tells us how in her description of Jamaican

Creole she made decisions on what to include and what to exclude by relying on her "own Sprachgefühl as a native speaker of the language," thus "abstracting the basilect," or another way she puts it, "abstracting a hypothetical dialect" (1965:173). She then associates her own linguistic achievement, her description of "hypothetical" Jamaican Creole, with Miller's novelistic product, a contrived, literary dialect. She makes this association by referring to the language of TCW as "one such hypothetical language" (173: emphasis mine). In other words, the reference for "such" can be read "one hypothetical language, TCW, such as my own description of a hypothetical Jamaican Creole." This comparison of a real dialect with a literary dialect she extends even as far as contrasting the "development of the system" of the dialect in TCW with Jamaican Creole. To view a literary dialect diachronically must be to place the ultimate of burdens on its adequacy and accuracy! Bailey's comparison of literary dialect with a linguistic description of a dialect is significant and very criticizable on at least two counts. She first of all puts the novelist Miller's aesthetic motivations and choices in constructing a literary dialect in the same category as her own choices as a linguist in scientifically describing a real dialect. Secondly, and aside from aesthetic vs. scientific motivations, the parallel she draws between her own work and Miller's strongly leads to the suspicion that she thought Miller was a native BEV speaker, according him the same advantages of intuition that she had as a native speaker of Jamaican Creole. It will be shown that Miller was neither a native speaker of BEV, nor was it likely that he had more than a casual contact with it.

III: The Cool World Dialect Criticized from External Evidence

It would be well to give a brief description of TCW, while presenting some very general criticism. This general criticism will be through external evidence about the author, including the circumstances under which the novel was written and some statements by the author that reveal both his limited knowledge of BEV and his ethnocentric language attitudes. TCW is a 160 page novel written entirely in literary dialect from the first person point of view of its main character, 14 year-old Duke Custis, the leader of a black teenage gang in Harlem. Thus this novel is part of the tradition of first person fictional narratives consciously written in literary dialect, including, among many other novels, The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Catcher in the Rye, and Louise Meriwether's Daddy Was a Number Runner. The time that the novel takes place would seem to be close to the year the novel was published, 1959. Throughout this book, author Warren Miller has sustained an obvious attempt to evoke the language of a fourteen year-old black Harlem gang leader of the 1950's. This he does through various language and literary devices. Miller states his language aspirations in a published interview where he speaks of this and other of his books, saying that "Each novel was, in a sense, an exercise in reproducing the language of the society I wrote about" (Wakin 1959:18).

In this same brief article we can also get several other insights: the limited extent to which the author was familiar with his dialect prototype; the limited methods he used to study the dialect and culture; and the limited extent to which he researched the dialect and culture. And finally, this article (plus other evidence) clearly establishes that the author was white, and that he furthermore did not live within a black culture and BEV speaking community.

Miller claims the idea for writing TCW came from hearing an Edward R. Murrow broadcast of taped interviews with gang members who were involved in a killing. He goes on to say how the voices of those gang members impressed him. Though he kept telling himself that "writing the book would be an exercise in language and no more," he adds that he really wanted his book to

"nave the social and political force of Uncle Tom's Cabin," and he wanted it to have a force and boldness lacking in "sociologists' treatises" (1959:18). (He does not say, though, that he in any way questioned these treatises.) In addition to the broadcast gang interviews, he mentions an earlier experience of living at the far edge of a white neighborhood just across from non-white, East Harlem. This limited experience plus Miller's questioning of a friend who was a Harlem youth-worker are all that is mentioned. If Miller had had exposure to black language and culture that was more significant than the above, the interview would likely have brought it out. Therefore, the tape broadcast, living near a black neighborhood, and talking to a social worker friend might very well sum up Miller's limited contact with black culture and language and the limited amount of research he put into it. This suspicion of limited contact and research is increased when Miller goes on to say, "I tried to do some systematic research, but once I had started writing I knew that the most important thing was to write freshly, to offer a view that is new and that matters" (1959:18). In contrast to the literary dialect efforts of writers like Samuel Clemens and Joel Chandler Harris, Miller's efforts at dialect accuracy appear quite limited.

It should be of some interest that Miller was white.[8] Bailey herself implied as much and probably thought so herself. This can be seen in how she claims advantages for herself in being a native speaker of the Jamaican Creole that she analysed, and then in the very next paragraph deferring to Miller because of her own unfamiliarity with BEV (1965:173). More important than Miller's being white, Miller can be seen as a white person whose exposure to black language and culture was meager. Yet fourteen years after the appearance of TCW, and eight years after Bailey's article, the linguist Robbins Burling in his book English in Black and White recommends TCW as a modern example of BEV by a black writer (1973:166). Very possibly this reference in Burling is the result of Bailey's article being so well-known, with her implication of Miller's blackness and "BEV-ness" having gone unchallenged -- in fact having become perpetuated in the linguistic literature.

A final bit of criticism on external grounds is Miller's ethnocentricity. While ethnocentricity on the part of an author won't in itself guarantee poor dialect representation,[9] kept in perspective with other evidence it can be viewed as a potential blinder to that author's perception of the dialect. Evidence of Miller's ethnocentricity, especially in relation to language attitudes, is contained in a review he did(1965:49) of Claude Brown's autobiographical Manchild in the Promised Land.[10] This review, written six years after the publication of his own TCW, harshly criticizes Brown's autobiography, indicting Brown's power of reasoning, accusing him of being a political "baby," and citing Brown as an example of cultural deprivation, saying that we the readers "are made shockingly aware of the immense cultural lag between the rich and the poor" (1965:49). This apparent language and culture bias is underscored when Miller makes the following self-revealing commment on the language of Brown's book:

> That education (Brown's), along with the fact of the ghetto itself, also guarantees the language in which this book is written: a vocabulary of a couple of hundred words and phrases -- not a language at all but an impoverished patois. That Brown shows the self-limiting course of writing in this argot makes for a literary disaster. No book can survive the deformity imposed by such a decision. (1965:49)

Miller, then, sees an "immense cultural lag" between black culture and language and white culture and language, lagging behind in an "impoverished" way. Within this high density of ethnocentrism, it would be generous to label as hyperbole "a vocabulary of a couple of hundred words and phrases." More to the point, it is an extremely naive statement on language, one that echoes statements on "primitive" languages that were made in the past century and earlier.

While none of the above criticism says anything directly about the dialect representation of BEV, such background knowledge should at least cause increased skepticism on the part of a linguist considering TCW as BEV data. By a preliminary investigation of a dialect writer and the circumstances surrounding the creation of the literary dialect, a linguist might come up with external evidence to aid in an estimation of the reliability of that literary dialect as linguistic data. In particular, the information above about Miller and the circumstances of writing TCW should cause a linguist at least to further question the reliability of TCW as linguistic data. It is ironic that Bailey should call for BEV speakers as linguistic analysts while at the same time turning to the very non-BEV speaker, Warren Miller, for BEV data to abstract her proposed underlying, deep structure forms of that dialect. It is perhaps also ironic that in the same year that Bailey published her paper, Warren Miller was making his ethnocentric attack upon the language of BEV speaking Claude Brown.

IV: Preliminaries to Evaluating The Cool World's Dialect

The linguistic evaluation of literary dialect raises several important questions that need comment here. The first of these is the question of which items of the prototype dialect does the author leave out, thus detracting from the linguistic accuracy of his representation. Among the influences on the author are the orthographic limitations of our alphabet. The job of "narrower transcription" to indicate dialect differences has to be performed by an alphabet that already contains fewer individual symbols than the language has phonemes. But even when the author ingeniously exploits the limited alphabet resouces, another influence comes to bear, the matter of readability. Sumner Ives in his "A Theory of Literary Dialect" sums this problem up well:

> Nearly all examples of literary dialect are deliberately incomplete; the author is an artist, not a linguist or a sociologist, and his purpose is literary rather than scientific. In working out his compromise between art and linguistics, each author has made his own decision as to how many of the peculiarities in his character's speech he can profitably represent; consequently, examples of literary dialect vary considerably in the extent to which they are "dialectal," and no very definite rules can be given regarding what to consider in that category. (1950:147)
>
> At some point, the author must restrain his desire to be comprehensive and give some thought to the patience and understanding of his readers. (155)

Thus the problem of readability is an aesthetic one as well as a practical one.

Another important influence on the dialect writer, one that Ives points out, is that the writer's own dialect determines much of what he considers to be different in the prototype dialect (1950:154,157,158). Thus, if the dialect writer's concept of standard English contains r-lessness like his own, then r-lessness in the prototype is not likely to be represented. In a sense, the r-less speaking author is "overfamiliar" with his prototype -- at least from the point of view of an r-ful speaker. We might expect this principle to be operating with Miller, a New York resident, representing Duke Custis, also a New York resident. Though Miller's dialect differs from the prototype BEV, both dialects can be expected to share features due to close geographical distribution. The r-lessness example might in fact apply right here.

But it seems to me that this "overfamiliarity" principle is over emphasized by literary critics, with underfamiliarity receiving little or no attention. Where an identity of features may blind the writer to what another sees as a difference, such as the r-less/r-ful example, also influencing an author is his limited knowledge of the prototype, preventing him from seeing some of the dialect's subtler features. This is an underfamiliarity in contrast to the above "overfamiliarity," but both influence the same end result -- prototype features not being represented in the literary dialect. We already have reason to suspect that Miller's dialect representation may lack various BEV features; in his limited exposure to BEV he was just not aware of them. Though we might expect such overlooked features to be more subtle, they can also in some cases be more significant features, ones important to Bailey, for example, in looking for deep structure differences. Consider how the dialect writer may note, on an obvious phonetic level, the absences of *is* and *are*, but in his relative unfamiliarity with BEV, he may fail to represent or misrepresent the more subtle syntactic patternings.

If an author is not only very familiar with the prototype, but is also a native speaker, one would expect him, according to Ives' view, to overlook a great many features in his literary dialect. He is extremely "overfamiliar." But this *reductio ad absurdum* should point out the need for a deeper investigation of literary dialect. With more and more BEV native speakers being published, their books may reveal more significant literary representations of BEV -- ones that do not emphasize superficial aspects, but rather portray BEV's more significant features through a natural expression of the author's own voice. Unfortunately, though, negative connotations of eye dialect and comic misspelling tend to cling to the concept of literary dialect, and the more praiseworthy a dialect representation may be, the less likely it is to even be perceived as literary dialect. Literary criticism has concerned itself too much with pronunciation matters, and especially the justifying of a particular author's eye dialect. In the process, worthier examples of literary dialect may have gone unexamined.

Many influences, then, are likely to limit the linguistic accuracy of any literary dialect -- alphabet limitations, readability considerations, the writer being motivated as an artist rather than a linguist, and the author's overfamiliarity or underfamiliarity with the prototype. These point up inherent limiations of literary dialect as linguistic data, and we should expect any dialect representation to be incomplete -- perhaps considerably so. Therefore, we should anticipate that some BEV items will be absent from *TCW*. To specifically point out missing BEV items should then contribute to a linguistic argument against the accuracy of the dialect -- though not necessarily an argument against its aesthetic or impressionistic effectiveness -- and as the total number of missing features increases, this linguistic argument becomes stronger.

An observation by Ives gives one additional reason to expect incomplete dialect representation:

> From the total linguistic material available, he selects those features that seem to be typical, to be most representative of the sort of person he is portraying. (153)

If an author selects the most "typical" and most "representative" features, then he is providing just those features with which the linguist is most likely already to be familiar. Aesthetically, this seems to be as it should. Subtle features that a reader doesn't know are likely to be lost on him and are not likely to bring the dialect alive in his mind. But linguistically, we can see further cause of deficiencies in literary dialect as data.

Another question raised in the linguistic evaluation of literary dialect is the distinction that needs to be made between linguistic and aesthetic criticisms of literary dialect. Aesthetic criticisms of literary dialect treat those features that are present, but rarely point out missing features contained in the prototype -- for example Rulon's study of The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (1967), Ives' study of Joel Chandler Harris (1955), Stockton's study of Poe's "The Gold-Bug" (1964) and Krapp's study of several different dialect writers (1925:225-273). This linguistic study, on the other hand, will seek also to discover which features are not represented in the data. To ascertain that a feature is missing requires extra readings, seeking out individual features, and it should be pointed out that claims that a feature is not represented are supported by and subject to these extra readings.

Code switching is another important question -- that is, using alternate features from two or more dialects. It has become almost a cliche to say that such switching in real life is inevitable, largely unconscious, usually triggered by a situational context, and that there is no such thing as a pure dialect. Dialects will overlap and become confused in any speaker to varying degrees. But the mechanism and nature of such switching and the nature of bidialectism seem complex. Any claims to dialect inaccuracy based on inconsistent switching would therefore be tenuous. However, such at least apparent inconsistencies will be pointed out, and I think I am supported in this, on aesthetic grounds, by Ives:

> These (typical) features he (the dialect writer) generalizes so that the literary dialect is likely to be more regular in its variants than the actual speech which it represents. The character is likely to use initial (d) in every word in which an educated character would use initial (ð), in spite of the fact that it is by no means certain that the man in real life would do so. (1950:153)

In other words, we may surmise that inconsistencies in Miller's dialect representation are less likely to be representative of real life code switching, and more likely to be examples of his incomplete, inaccurate knowledge and representation of BEV.

Also needing consideration here is the hotly debated matter of which items are shared by both BEV and white non-standard English, and which, if any, are exclusively BEV items. Some of the items to be considered are clearly shared by both. But my present position is that there are some clear differences between BEV dialects and non-standard white dialects; I find some of the creolists' arguments, with their convergence models, convincing over some arguments by those of dialect geographer or other non-creolist, divergence model persuasions.[11] Though it is not the purpose of this paper to further debate these matters, it is well to note that the main thrust of this paper would be weakened by a dialect geographer or "no BEV" position. There would not, for example, be as much point in arguing that Miller is not well-versed in BEV and does not represent it well if my viewpoint were that discrete BEV features are nearly or even wholly nonexistent.

Finally, something needs to be said about BEV studies that can be used for comparison to features found in TCW. The items examined in TCW are described, among other places, in Labov and Cohen (1967), Williamson (1968), Labov, Cohen, Robins, and Lewis (Vols. I & II 1968), Fasold and Wolfram (1970), Wolfram (1971), Dillard (1972), Labov (1972a), and Labov (1972b).[12] It should be pointed out that these all came out after the publication of Miller's novel and Bailey's article, and that earlier studies were not as detailed and lacked later discoveries. Therefore, criticism of Bailey's choice

of data has to be tempered with the knowledge that many BEV studies were not existent in 1965. However, some relevant studies were available, including Herskovits (1941), Kenyon (1947), Turner (1949), and McDavid and McDavid (1951). More recent and detailed studies also existed. In 1965 when Bailey's article came out, studies of black dialect in Northern urban ghettos had already been well under way, supported by the U.S. Office of Education under "Project Literacy," and at least one report was published in that same year (Labov, Cohen, & Robins 1975). It must be acknowledged that any conclusion that Bailey's choice of TCW was a poor one was reached partly with the advantage of hindsight, namely BEV studies not available to Bailey in 1965 -- the kind of studies, in fact, that she was calling for in her 1965 paper. But however much hindsight may help in showing a poor choice of data by Bailey, her actual choice at the time lacked foresight.

V: Be in BEV: Live Informant Studies vs. Bailey's Study from Literary Dialect

1. Is/Are/Am Occurrence

Bailey's argument for black-white speech differences, with BEV deep structure ties to "Proto-Creole", centers almost exclusively on the verb in BEV, and in particular the verb be. Her attention to the verb be is not surprising, for as Labov points out, absences of is and are (auxiliary be and copula, present tense forms) are "one of the most well-known characteristics" of BEV (1972b:48). In keeping with BEV's reputation for withholding is and are, Miller also frequently omits them, as well as am, as may be seen from just a cursory examination of TCW. Bailey herself gives two reasons for her own emphasis on the verb. First of all, she points out how structural linguists, in failing to properly understand and adequately investigate black speech in America, have made some of their most "linguistically naive" comments about the verb in black speech (1965:171-2). Secondly, she notes that R.W. Thompson, by citing similarities in verb systems, supported a theory of similarities between Old World pidgins and New World creoles (1965:172). Thus, by setting out to study the behavior of be in TCW, Bailey hoped to show that black speech in America does not have a confused structure that is imperfectly related to white forms of English, as Mencken and McDavid seem to say (Bailey 1965:171-2), but rather it has its own orderly structure whose underlying forms are found in the branches of the creole/pidgin family tree. Her argument is an interesting one, but her choice of data is unfortunate, for as will become obvious, Miller's literary representation of the verb be in BEV is inaccurate and unreliable in several significant ways.

To begin, we will compare the frequencies of is/are occurrence in TCW with frequencies found in a study by Wolfram based on live informants (1971). Offhand, what we should expect to find, and will find, is a generally higher frequency of is/are deletions in TCW, but a closer examination will show that Miller achieved this high frequency through an inaccurate representation of BEV. The expected higher frequency of deletions in the fictional world can be ascribed to Bailey's previously cited assumption that a dialect writer "regularly packs his dialogue with those features which he knows to be most distinctive" (1965:173; emphasis mine). This is similar to a view of Ives, who says that a dialect writer "selects those features that seem to be typical," emphasizing them to the point where his literary representation is likely to be more regular than "the actual speech which it represents" (1950:153). Therefore, if BEV is characterized by some absence of be forms, but not completely, Ives and Bailey would lead us to expect a larger percentage of be forms to be absent in a literary dialect representation of BEV.

In "Black-White Speech Differences Revisited," Wolfram presents some figures that can be used for comparison. Though Wolfram's informants were of a six to eight year old range and from a rural area in the Mississippi Delta

(contrasting with TCW's teenage black urban setting), they are of interest here and can be justified for comparison for at least three reasons. First of all, Wolfram's results include data from white informants whose speech also displays absences of be (1971:149). Secondly, we might expect, if anything, that a Southern rural black speech will have converged less with standard English than Northern urban black speech, thus displaying a greater number and frequency of BEV features. (As we will see later in this section, studies by Labov bear this out.) This greater number and frequency of BEV features would then parallel the dialect writer's "regularly packing his dialogue with those features". And thirdly, Bailey's comments and conclusions encompass a larger spectrum of black speech than that of black teenagers in Northern inner cities.

In order to gather appropriate figures to compare with Wolframs, I counted the total occurrences (contracted forms tallied separately) and deletions of is and are in 22 pages of TCW (52-62, 141-151). Table 1 shows the results of this count, along with my "% of total" calculations. Wolfram excluded so-called "exposed position"[13] occurrences, and so I have included these occurrences separately in the table for interest's sake. As can be seen, deletions are high, full form occurrences rare, and contracted forms almost nonexistent. The right half of Table 1 combines is and are occurrences, showing is and are to be deleted 88% of the time. Am was deleted, without exception, 33 times, bringing total is/are/am deletions to an even higher 90%.

Table 1
POSSIBLE OCCURRENCES OF IS/'S & IS/ARE IN TCW

	IS		ARE		IS & ARE		IS, ARE & AM	
	OCCURRENCES	% OF TOTAL	OCCURRENCES	% OF TOTAL	OCCURRENCES	% OF TOTAL	OCCURRENCES	% OF TOTAL
Full- IS/ARE	14	9	1	2	15	7	15	6
CONTRACTED - 's/'RE	12	7	0	0	12	5	12	4
DELETED - Ø	138	84	65	98	203	88	236	90
TOTALS	164		66		230		263	
EXPOSED POSITION	8		3		11		11	

Considering Labov's comment on the reputation that BEV has for deleting is and are, and considering Bailey's assumption and Ives' prediction that a dialect writer will overrepresent features of the prototype, then these high percentatages of deletions are what we should expect. Foregrounding, exaggeration, and perhaps also caricature have been achieved.

Table 2
IS/'S AND ARE/'RE OCCURRENCES WOLFRAM'S STUDY COMPARED TO TCW

	IS			ARE		
	WOLFRAM		THE COOL WORLD	WOLFRAM		THE COOL WORLD
	WHITE	BLACK		WHITE	BLACK	
FULL	38	54	9	34	17	2
CONTRACTED	60	18	7	44	6	0
DELETED	2	28	84	22	77	98
TOTALS	100	100	100	100	100	100

In Wolfram's figures we see that among his black informants there is a far lower percentage of is deletions than are deletions (28% as contrasted to 77%) and correspondingly there is a far higher percentage of full is occurrences than full are occurrences (54% as contrasted to 17%). In TCW, on the other hand, there is very little contrast between full is and full are occurrences. Both are simply rare (9% and 2%), with a corresponding closeness in the percentage and prevalence of is and are deletion (84% and 98%). The grammar com-

plexities that account for the contrast in Wolfram's data are lost in Miller's literary dialect. The *is* vs. *are* distinction is leveled. Dialect writers can, and likely do, make use of formulas. These formulas very likely oversimplify, distort, and at best vaguely resemble the actual rules, whatever they are, of the real prototype. Without claiming Miller used a formula for representing *be* in BEV, I nevertheless suggest the possibliity. This formula could read something like: "Delete every instance of *is*, *are*, and *am*, except where the sentence doesn't make sense." (The condition would correspond to Wolfram's "exposed position," or Labov's "where Standard English cannot contract".) Such a formula could explain the leveling of the contrast in *is* vs. *are* deletion found in Wolfram's data.

By combining full occurrences and contracted occurrences in Table 3, the data is reorganized in a binary fashion to now show either occurrence or non-occurrence of the verb. This new arrangement highlights an interesting possible relationship between Miller's literary dialect and Wolfram's white informants. Where the white informants seldom delete, Miller seldom retains the verb.

Table 3
SAME AS TABLE 2 BUT FULL AND CONTRACTED ITEMS COMBINED

	IS			ARE		
	WOLFRAM		THE COOL WORLD	WOLFRAM		THE COOL WORLD
	WHITE	BLACK		WHITE	BLACK	
FULL AND CONTRACTED	98	72	16	78	23	2
DELETED	2	28	84	22	77	98
TOTALS	100	100	100	100	100	100

This inversely proportional relationship, on the other hand, is not evidenced in the black informant data, which does not show the extreme contrast between occurrrence and non-occurrence. If a dialect writer's formula is operating, this could explain this inverse proportion, for Miller would have simply been deleting from a white dialect all unexposed occurrrences of *is* and *are*, both full and contracted forms. What Miller might have in essence done, in a formula way, was to delete the frequently occurring contractions of *is* and *are* in his own white dialect, gaining in the process a high density and exaggeration of the deleted *is*/*are* characteristic. But in so doing, his literary dialect failed to represent the relatively small but significant occurrence of contracted *is* and *are* in BEV -- an occurrence that in fact is larger for Northern urban informants.[14] A linguist using such data to speculate about creole origins is likely to be misled.

A more representative group for comparison than Wolfram's is given by Labov (1972b:82ff). His informants are as close as one could ever hope to come to the type of character Duke Custis is supposed to be, for Labov's informants are teenage Harlem gang members, and even the time of gathering the data probably began less than ten years later than TCW's time setting. Labov's data is broken down somewhat differently than Wolfram's, giving more detailed consideration to environments that may condition the occurrence or absence of *is* forms. The data for comparison was once again taken from the same 22 pages of *TCW*. Table 4 gives a breakdown of *is* occurrences in *TCW* according to whether the subject is a pronoun or some other NP. These tallies are than converted into "% of total" figures. Table 5 juxtaposes the percent figures of Table 4 with percent figures taken from Labov (1972b:84).[15]

Table 4
IS OCCURRENCES IN TCW PRONOUN SUBJECT VS. OTHER NP SUBJECT

	NP		Pro	
	OCCUR-RENCES	% OF TOTAL	OCCUR-RENCES	% OF TOTAL
IS	8	14	14	13
'S	0	0	10	9
Ø	48	86	84	78
TOTALS	56		108	

Labov concludes the following from his research (1972b:85):

> The single most important constraint on deletion in BEV, and upon contraction in SE and BEV, is one which we did not expect: whether or not the subject is a pronoun or some other noun phrase.

Table 5 shows that Miller's representation of is with a pronoun subject is close to the actual usage of the T-Birds. But once again he fails to show an apparently significant occurrence of the contracted form. Thus, if the 's occurrences are combined with the deleted occurrences, TCW comes close to the T-Birds patterning, 95% for the latter and 87% for the former. But when the subject is an NP other than a pronoun, Miller's representation is far from the mark.

Table 5
IS OCCURRENCES - PRONOUN VS. OTHER NP SUBJECT TCW COMPARED TO LABOV'S STUDY

	NP		Pro	
	T-BIRDS	TCW	T-BIRDS	TCW
IS	63	14	5	13
'S	25	0	44	9
Ø	12	86	51	78
TOTALS	100	100	100	100

Where is in the full form is most common with the T-Birds (63%), deleted occurrence is most common In TCW (86%). In fact, if the data is once again rearranged for a binary opposition of occurrence vs. non-occurrence, as in Table 6, the patterning of the real-life T-Birds is at one extreme from the patterning of the fictional Duke Custis -- 88% occurrence in contrast to Duke's 86% non-occurence. The suspicion is that a writer's formula just happened to be accurate for pronoun subjects, but was highly inaccurate for other-NP subjects. Or perhaps the actual pronoun subject patterning of BEV suggested the formula, with the often difficult to hear contracted forms interpreted as deletions.

Table 6
SAME AS TABLE 5 BUT FULL AND CONTRACTED ITEMS COMBINED

	NP		Pro	
	T-BIRDS	TCW	T-BIRDS	TCW
IS & 'S	88	14	49	22
Ø	12	86	51	78
TOTALS	100	100	100	100

That somewhat accurate formula was then misapplied in other-NP environments.

Table 7 represents data taken again from the same 22 pages of TCW, counted this time with respect to the verb complement environment. Table 8 juxtaposes the TCW data with the T-Birds data. Two columns of particular interest here are the progressive (___V+ing) and the "going to" future (___gon'/gonna).

Table 7

IS OCCURRENCES BY VERB COMPLEMENT CATEGORY - TCW

	NP		Adj		Loc		Vting		gon' gonna		EXPOSED POSITION OCCURRENCE
	OCCUR-RENCES	% OF TOTAL	OCCUR-RENCES	% OF TOTAL	OCCUR-RENCES	% OF TOTAL	OCCUR-RENCES	% OF TOTAL	OCCUR-RENCES	% OF TOTAL	
IS	13	22	1	3	2	18	1	2	0	0	8
'S	6	10	4	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	
Ø	40	68	34	87	9	82	41	98	6	86	
TOTALS	59		39		11		42		7		8

With the latter, Miller seems to be right on target. With the former, Miller would be accurate were it not once again for the conspicuous failure to represent the contracted 's.

Table 8

IS OCCURRENCES BY VERB COMPLEMENT CATEGORY - TCW VS. T-BIRDS

	NP		Adj		Loc		Vting		gon' gonna	
	T-BIRDS	TCW	T-BIRDS	TCW	T-BIRDS	TCW	T-BIRDS	TCW	T-BIRDS	TCW
IS	40	22	25	3	30	18	4	2	0	0
's	37	10	27	10	34	0	30	0	12	14
Ø	23	68	48	87	36	82	66	98	88	86
TOTALS	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Labov points out that the 1st person singular I'm "occurs with overwhelming frequency, despite the fact that it is possible to find rare instances of plain I, I is, or even I'm is". He goes on to say that I'm occurs in "well over 99 percent of the cases" (1972b:70).[16] In TCW, on the other hand, case after case of I followed by an absence of 'm (or any other form of be) can be found. By simply turning to the examples that Bailey took from TCW to illustrate absence of be, four of her 24 examples contain instances of I followed by no be forms, while none of these sentences contains I'm.

1. I sure they aroun. (26)
2. "I glad he gone." Little Man say. (31)
3. I in a big hurry. (7)
4. "I with you Duke Man." He say. (36)

To get some idea of the frequency of Miller's deletion of 'm, I counted the possible occurrences of am over the same 22 pages of TCW. Of 33 possible occurrences, all were deleted. Therefore, Miller's representation is the exact opposite of Labov's findings -- 100% non-occurrence of 'm as opposed to Labov's "well over 99 percent occurrence."

In this section on Bailey's examination of be in TCW and BEV, it should, finally, be pointed out that Bailey's study makes no mention of the frequencies of occurrence of the features she notes in TCW, nor does she quite make clear what she means by "absence of copulas" (1965:173). Though she does not adequately delimit what she means by copulas, by studying her examples and following her argument, it seems safe to assume that she means the present forms is, are, and am, including their contracted variations 's, 're and 'm. Discussions of is/are deletion in BEV typically include progressive be + ing forms, and as we shall see later, Miller almost without exception deletes is and are of the progressive. However, Bailey gives no examples of and nowhere comments on the progressive be + ing forms, so that, even though most later BEV discus-

sions conveniently use "copula" as an abbreviation for "copula and auxiliary be" (Labov 1972b:67), we must assume that she misses or at best chooses not to point out the progressive patterns that parallel the behavior of copula.

Bailey extracts from the novel 24 examples which, she claims, reveal this "absence of copulas" (1965:173). But by not in any way referring to frequency of occurrence, she could just as well have given 24 like examples that "reveal a presence of copulas". In a parallel fashion to the way Bailey groups her 24 examples of absence of copulas, the following 24 examp es do the opposite:

Before Adjectives

1. Shapiro is okay he aint always yellen at us like the rest of them. (14)
2. "The Man is right." Handy say. (15)
3. Finely I feel the sun on my knees and know the line is gone an the street all light with out the shados. (126)
4. It is brass and it made like the snout of some kinda animal. (8)
5. Where the lion was the sky all black an he keep movin into where the sky is clear. (86)
6. All of you is a like. (41)

Before Nominals

7. "Like I say Lu Ann is the Crocadile whore." (32)
8. "That is one sweet piece the Biretta." (15)
9. He say. "Duke Man this is the stuff." (151)
10. "Man this is livin." (32)
11. Thats Bloods real name. (20)
12. "This here is Tommy." (63)

With Locatives

13. "He is home from Fisk." (20)
14. "Any body know where is Little Man?" (76)
15. ...and him an Rod start to talkin about wheres this one an that one. (63)
16. They are out an by themselves alone. (12)
17. Some times I think about the old days. Wonder about Lu Ann an think where is she? (160)
18. ...but Man that Park is all by itself. (62)

After the Filler Subjects "There" and "It"

19. When theys blood already they wont quit till they is more blood. (74)
20. I folla him in to a parlor where they is a big desk
21. Then they is the money problem of rent time comin up on the club house. (120)
22. The East 70s cooler than whut it is up town. (131)
23. On the desk they is a phone with buttons on it... (43)
24. ...an they is one other whose name I will not mention. (136)

By a comparison to live informant studies, I have shown how Miller's representation of be in BEV is in several ways -- some quite significant -- inaccurate and inadequate, so that any conclusions drawn by Bailey based on this data have to be suspect. Items brought into question here include unrepresented contraction occurrence, allowing Bailey to overlook an alternate view to the zero-copula position, namely the contraction-deletion position. Also, Miller failed completely in capturing the behavior of am/'m in BEV, and he also took a pronoun subject pattern of full-form absence and destroyed any possibility of insight by incorrectly extending it to other-NP subject environments. Just generally, Miller's caricatured dialect for Duke Custis exaggerated and overextended BEV patterns to the point where subtler patterns would be completely missed -- patterns that, as Labov points out, have unexpected environmental conditioning (1972b). In places where his data matches neither the data from

white informants nor black, further examination revealed a suspicious relationship to the white informant data. And finally the particular inaccuracies and distortions of BEV in TCW show strong possibilities of oversimplified literary dialect formulas having operated.

VI: Other BEV Inaccuracies in The Cool World

There are of course many other BEV items that can be considered in criticizing the accuracy of TCW's dialect. Four items more will be considered, ones that Bailey does not take up, but which certainly should be considered in any thorough study that attempts to describe the deep structure of BEV.

1. Multiple Negativization

An item that has to bear a heavy burden in establishing accuracy in any literary representation of BEV is multiple negativization. Though it is com-com to many non-standard dialects, Labov asserts that negativization has not received enough attention, being more complex than suspected (1972b:131):

> It appears that the problem of dialect differences in negative concord has not been properly appraised. The naive view is that the non-standard dialects simply have too many negatives.

He goes on to say that differences in negation patterns from dialect to dialect are extensive (1972b:132). There are negative rules which seem basic to all dialects, and multiple negation rules that are basic to most non-standard dialects. These needn't concern us more than just to mention them.[17] Standard English places a negative in the first possible position, with the option of shifting that negative to the right to an indefinite.

1. Anybody can do it.
2. Nobody can do it.
3. I know something.
4. I don't know anything.
5. I know nothing.

In non-standard English, instead of shifting the negative to the right, the negative is "copied". 4 would become 6.

6. I don't know nothing.

This "copying" can be extended to a general rule that negatives are attracted to all indeterminates (Labov 1972b:145). Labov fabricates an extreme example of this rule that extends negative attraction to general "negative concord" (1972b:147):

> I ain't gonna sit here in no chair and let no crazy lawyer never tell me no lies about no law that no judge told no smart-ass clerk to look up in no book that no smart politician wrote or nothin' like that nohow.

This negative concord is common in BEV and results in emphasis. This emphasis is lost in the following non-negative occurrences in BEV, underlined for emphasis. These are representative of frequent examples throughout the novel, being inaccurate in the low frequency of negative concord rule application, and detracting from the dialect impression:

7. I dont want have anythin further to do with this boy. (41)
8. ...because most of the time they dont have any. (52)
9. I dont say any thing. (78)
10. ...an voices not sayin anythin you can make out. (81)
11. I mean they aint my favorite animal or anything. (84)

12. He jus layin there with his big yellow eyes not lookin at anything. (84)

By contrast, here are some examples of BEV negative concord from Brown's autobiographical Manchild in the Promised Land (1965).

13. I bet you a fat man he never throwed nobody else clothes out no window. (41)
14. I ain't got no time to be goin' no place complainin' about nothin'... (282)
15. I ain't goin' back to no damn court no more. (30)

Though a distinct disadvantage in literary dialect representation is that suprasegmentals cannot be shown, the temptation here is to say that the above examples bring to life the rhythm and stress that would be found in an actual BEV utterance.

By contrast, many of the sentences in TCW that contain negatives seem weak and unconvincing. For example, the following three sentences could have been further negativized by the negative concord rule and would have gained stylistic emphasis by the close-proximity alliteration. (Phrases in brackets suggest the greater possible negativization.)

16. ...We don have any idee no more of what they strenth is. (102)
[no idee no more]
17. We sit there for a while an no body say any thing. (158)
[nobody say nothing]
18. When you have a gun then you aint no animal any more. (22)
[aint no animal no more]

In the next examples, negatives have been added to demonstrate ways in which greater negativization could have occurred -- and therefore greater accuracy and authenticity. (The additions are placed within brackets, and if this addition requires a deletion from the original, that element to be deleted is placed within parentheses.)

19. Man I dont have [no] time to go up and down (this) [no] street (a) [no] thousan times... (7)
20. Priest dont flip it around like (a) [no] cowboy. (7)
21. Dont know why I aint (ever) [never] throw it out. (22)
22. Lu Ann and me we dont talk [no] money no more. (49)

There seems to be operating in multiple negativization, and especially in BEV, a stylistic or emphatic device that not only negativizes indefinites and adverbs, but also adds emphasis by seizing upon words that though no negatives, have the /n/ sound, such as now, or especially words that have the /no/ sound, know. Thus the following occurred in both an actual utterance that I transcribed from a television news broadcast when a dock worker was being asked his opinion of the nerve gas missile controversy:

23. Ain't nobody never knowed nothing about it.

Here the stylistic emphasis is gained not just by the four negatives, but also by the/no/ sound in knowed and by the alliteration of four n's in a row. And note in 24. the addition of the third negative (or negative phrase) "noway", an example from Juanita Williamson's study of BEV:

24. They can't do nothing with him noway. (1968:50)

For the literal meaning of the sentence it is unnecessary. Its purpose, rather, seems to be the emphatic stressing or underlining of refusal and protest. This phrase noway is similar to others like no how and no such

thing.

2. Embedded Yes-No Questions - If-Less Flip-Flop

In standard English a question like

1. Can he go?

may be embedded as an indirect question to form sentences like

2. I don't know if he can go.
3. If he can go, I will tell you.

In other words, standard English if-clauses like in 2, functioning as direct objects, have a structure analogous to adverbially functioning if-clauses like in 3. BEV, on the other hand, would typically embed a question quite differently than 2. Word order inversion would operate,[18] and the *if* would not be inserted, giving

4. I don't know can he go.

However, in contrast to BEV *noun* if-clauses, BEV *adverbial* if-clauses display the same inverted word order as standard English. Therefore, unlike standard English, BEV noun if-clauses are not analogous in form to BEV adverbial if-clauses.

Labov points out that this non-standard type of embedding is an important BEV feature that can produce serious communication difficulties between BEV speakers and standard English speakers (1972b:226). In a repetition experiment, young BEV speakers were asked to repeat a series of sentences having the form of the above standard English example 2. The speakers showed confusion, but then tended to repeat the sentences translated into their own if-less flip-flop form like 4. Stewart and Baratz went further and did a "turnabout" form of the experiment, where standard English speakers were confused by the BEV forms (1969). Similar to Labov's experiment, the young informants then translated into their own "if-full", *un*-flip-flopped standard English form. These experiments show the importance of this form in BEV.

But just how unique this feature is as a BEV characteristic in contrast to other non-standard dialects does not seem yet to be well established. A comparison of the above example 4, taken from Dillard's *Black English* (1972:63), with four examples from Labov et al (1968 V.I:297-8) may give an idea of one place where BEV parts company with other non-standard English dialects.

5. I wonder is he going.[19]
6. Ask him did he do it.
7. He should decide is he able.
8. I don't know can he go.

My intuition tells me that my own white non-standard English which I grew up speaking would allow me to utter sentences like 5 through 7, with my intended meaning being the same as would a BEV speaker's. In standard English these would translate as

9. I wonder if he is going.
10. Ask him if he did it.
11. He should decide if he is able.

But my intuition also tells me that I would not utter sentences like number 8, and furthermore, had it not been for the explanations of linguists like Labov and Dillard, I very well might not even have understood such utterances if I had heard a BEV speaker make them.

I will attempt to give some analytical support to these intuitions. The if-less, flip-flopped form in 5 can be interpreted as a direct quotation, but a thought rather than dialogue being quoted in this example. A play would distinguish thoughts from dialogue by using a stage direction such as "aside", while a cartoon strip would make this distinction by using a cloud instead of a bubble. Written narratives ordinarily would

use quotation marks for both situations, making the distinction between directly quoted speech and directly quoted thoughts by the form that "he-said/she-said" takes. Said, exclaimed, shouted, pronounced, asked, etcetera might be used for directly quoted speech, while thought, wondered, asked himself, mused etcetera might be used for directly quoted thoughts. Thus, 5 could be written with quotation marks without any essential change in meaning:

12. I wonder, "Is he going?"

6 and 7, on the other hand, if interpreted as direct quotations would be a misinterpretation. The following further illustrate this misinterpretation.

13. Ask him if you can do it. (standard)
14. Ask him can you do it. (non-standard)
15. Ask him, "Can you do it?"
16. Ask him, "Can I do it?"

The non-standard utterance 14 is equivalent to the standard utterance 13 and the direct quotes utterance 16. But this same utterance is not equivalent to the direct quotes utterance 15. Therefore, 14 should not be interpreted as an underpunctuated equivalent of 15, even though a listener, because of ambiguity, might misinterpret them as being equivalent.

However, the potential for the merging of direct and indirect quotation becomes clearer when we construct a similar sequence, but eliminate from the embedded sentences pronouns that allow ambiguity of point of view.

17. I asked her if it burned. (standard)
18. I asked her did it burn. (non-standard)
19. I asked her, "Did it burn?"
20. I asked her, "Did it burn?"

19 and 20, though arrived at by different processes, just as 15 and 16 were, turn out to be identical sequences, unlike 15 and 16. Therefore, the sequence 14, though not being in any way equivalent to 15, can be formed by analogy with 18, which in fact is equivalent to 20. What I am suggesting is that what might be a distinction here between BEV and other non-standard dialects is that the other non-standard dialects may only permit the if-less flip-flop form when the verb in the matrix sentence permits an interpretation, correct or incorrect, that quoted dialogue or thought is following. The number of verbs would seem to be large. I had junior-high students, in fact, compile a list of over one hundred variations on "he-said". In our examples of non-standard embeddings of yes-no questions, however, there seems to be only one example of a matrix sentence verb that will not permit an interpretation of direct quotes to follow -- the verb know. And it is the sentence containing this verb that I cannot accept in my own white non-standard dialect.

My argument, of course, rests on my intuition about the sentence type "I don't know can he go", which only has to do with my own variety of white non-standard English, not necessarily others'. Furthermore, I wouldn't reject an apparently similar example from Wolfram and Fasold (1970:83).

21. I want to know did he go somewhere.

Perhaps the deeper embedding of the yes-no question in 21 is what allows me to easily understand this sentence, but not 8. Ellipsis seems more likely in 21 than 8, making an interpretation like 22 for 21, but not 23 for 8.[20]

22. I want to know (the answer to my question), "Did he go somewhere?"
23. I don't know (the answer to my question), "Can he go?"

But given the importance of this form in BEV, shown by Labov and others, and by own tentative argument that a subcategory of this form may be rather unique to BEV, we can now turn to TCW to see how well, if at all, this struc-

ture is represented. In an accurate and adequate representation of BEV, we would anticipate finding such structures. In fact, not a single example could be found of this non-standard way of embedding question, either of the "ask" variety or the "know" variety, and this despite the fact that some non-standard speakers are so locked into that structure that they have difficulty comprehending the standard form (and vice versa, of course). But one might ask are such embedded questions simply rare in most discourse. If so, then perhaps a 160 page novel could begin and end without a single occurrence of a yes-no question embedding, standard or non-standard in form. If such rarity is the case, then it could also explain the bi-directional communication breakdowns between standard and non-standard speakers, greater breakdowns than for many other items, i.e. the communication problems caused by infrequent dialect contacts would be increased by the infrequent occurrence of embedded yes-no questions.

However, this apology for Miller is cut short by the following five sentences (six examples) of embedded question:

24. Rod say to him you know like he care a damn if Tommy get up set or not. (65)
25. "I wunder if you would mind if I took you friend Tommy here for a little walk." (65)
26. Then he look at me an wait to see if I gonna say any thing. (78)
27. "You motheren. You see if I dont come back." (78)
28. Then I ask the Snakes if they got anymore to report. (123)

Note that each example embeds a yes-no question (28 embeds two) using the standard English if form, with the analogous regular word order of adverbial if-clauses. Translated into the if-less flip-flop form, these sentences might have read something like the following:

29. Rod say to him you know like he care a damn do Tommy get up set or not.
30. I wunder would you mind do I take you friend Tommy here for a little walk.
31. Then he look at me an wait to see am I gonna say any thing.
32. You motheren. You see dont I come back.
33. Then I ask the Snakes do they got anymore to report.

There are other verbs like know, by the way, that might also preclude an interpretation that direct quotes are to follow:

34. I don't care can you go.
35. I don't mind can you go.
36. I'm not aware can you go.

These, of course, are fabricated examples, and whether or not they could occur in BEV or any other dialect is unknown. By the same token, 32 and 33 are also fabricated examples, containing the matrix verbs care and mind, and they also may not be possible in BEV.

Generally speaking, the above suggests the low probability of certain important, complex dialect features appearing in an author's literary dialect representation, especially if that author has not been thoroughly immersed in that dialect. More specifically, a linguist looking into The Cool World would not find enlightenment on yes-no question embedding in BEV.

3. Embedded Wh-Questions - Optional Flip-Flop

Similar to the embedded yes-no questions discussed above, embedded Wh-questions can also be found that maintain the inverted word order for questions.

BEV thus contains sentences of this structure similar to the following:

1. We asked them where are they going.
2. I don't know how did I do it.

But unlike the if-less flip-flop construction, this feature is apparently less common, alternating with the standard English uninverted word order.

3. I asked them where they are going.
4. I don't know how I did it.

(The subordinating conjunctions do not delete -- there is no where-less or how-less form, for example, to parallel the if-less yes-no embedding. Wh markers, of course, carry more meaning content than if, and in the absence of redundancy they would seem necessary.)

Embedded Wh-questions, in other words, are often analogous in structure to adverbial clauses, as is the case regularly in standard English. Burling (1973:67-8) and others speak of the non-standard Wh-question embedding as an optional rule. No example of this rule applying, however, could be found in TCW.

4. Optional Do-Support

In standard English, question word order inversion requires the presence of at least one of the following in the auxiliary: A modal, the perfect marker (have), the progressive marker (be), the be of passive, and the copula be. In the absence of any of these, the verb do is inserted, often referred to as "do-support".

1. Mary goes home quickly.
2. *Goes Mary home quickly?
3. *Where goes Mary quickly?
4. *Where go Mary quickly?
5. *How goes Mary home?
6. *How go Mary home?
7. Does Mary go home quickly?
8. Where does Mary go quickly?
9. How does Mary go home?

Only 7, 8, and 9 are standard English transformations of 1. In transformational terms, we have a "floating tense" until do is inserted.

10. present Mary go home quickly?
11. Where present Mary go quickly?
12. How present Mary go home?

Black English, by contrast, can form questions without inserting do. Compare 13 and 14 with 8 and 9.

13. Where Mary go?
14. How Mary go?

But it needs to be pointed out that optional do-support operates not only in Black English, but also in other non-standard dialects and even in casual styles of standard English. For example, in the following standard English sentences, 18 and 19 are in a casual style. Furthermore, 19 may only be superficially the same as Black English structure, being really a case of contraction and deletion: when did→when'd→when.

15. The mail came late.

16. Did the mail come late?
17. When did the mail come?
18. The mail came late?
19. When the mail come?

There are frequent examples of optional do-support operating in TCW, but many seem identical, in surface form at least, to casual standard English examples. Consider the following:

20. "Why you wanta know?" (160)
21. "You ever see anything like it?" (114)
22. "Royal get picked up?" I ask her. (114)
23. "What kind of piece you say it was Duke man?" (15)

There are also examples of do-support operating, which of course is in keeping with an optional rule:

24. "Did I hear right thinkin it Bloods voice I hear?" (80)
25. "Did they kill him?" (121)
26. And did GOD make this world. (10)

Finally, there are examples that seem more clearly to be non-standard English, perhaps even uniquely BEV:

27. "Where he gone?" (24)
28. "How you like that Man?" (25)
29. "How it happen?"
30. "Where you come from boy?" (158)

Considering that many of the examples found are at least superficially similar to other non-standard English forms, and in a few cases even to casual styles of standard English, then not much can be concluded on this optional do-support item about Miller's dialect accuracy. In any case, if subtler distinctions do exist between BEV and other dialects, we should not expect TCW to provide us with the data to discover them.

VII: NOTES

1. In most of the following pages I will be using the term "black English vernacular" (abbreviated BEV), which Labov defines in the following way (1972b:xiii):

> ...(a) relatively uniform grammar found in its most consistent form in the speech of black youth from 8 to 19 years old who participate fully in the street culture of the inner cities.

Labov's restrictions on his term "black English vernacular" fit my purposes perfectly, as will be seen later, but no allegiance to Labov's positions are meant in using his term. BEV, then, will be the term used here, even though it will be mildly anachronistic when talking about Bailey's article, not having been coined yet in 1965.

Labov also points out how "Nonstandard Negro English" became "less acceptable to many people", but how the replacement term "black English" is not narrow enough for his purposes, encompassing all the language forms used by black Americans. Labov might have added that, as used by Dillard (1972), "Black English" goes far beyond the borders of the United States, describing any and all forms of English, English creoles, and English pidgins spoken by black people anywhere in the world. Dalby (1970), in talking about creole-influenced speech of blacks all over the world, makes such distinctions as Black English, Black Portuguese, Black Spanish, Black Dutch, and Black French. To subcategorize Black English, he refers to the speech of most blacks in the United States as Black American English -- distin-

guishing it, for example, from Black Caribbean English. (Dillard and Dalby, by the way, capitalize "black", while Labov uses lower case.) Thus in the introductory section of this paper, I use the term Black English intentionally, desiring the more general denotation in that context.

2. Labov extensively discusses this problem, along with his solutions to it, in Chapter 8 of Sociolinguistic Patterns, where he describes the "observer's paradox" as the problem of finding out "how people talk when they are not being systematically observed" even though obtaining the data requires systematic observation. Elsewhere Labov discusses what he considers to be another serious problem in live data gathering, namely that the most available informants are the most isolated from the "vernacular culture". He gives the BEV slang term "lame" to this whole range of social isolates (1972b:Chapter 7).

3. Here is Sumner Ives' opinion on the matter (1950:177):
> There can be no doubt that the pages of a story are a poor substitute for adequate fieldwork by a competent phonetician; however, if it can be decided that a particular author is, in general, reliable, it is possible that his literary dialect will supply details, especially in vocabulary and structure, that are missing from the phonetician's record.

4. Notable examples include Ives' study of Joel Chandler Harris (1955), Stockton's study of Poe's "The Gold-Bug" (1964) and Rulon's study of The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (1967).

5. The creole based theory of Black English claims that the forms of English spoken by many black people in the United States have important features in them that go back historically through creole languages to trade languages known as pidgins -- in particular English based pidgins of the West African coast. Of the many articles and several books written on the subject, William A. Stewart's "Continuity and Change in American Negro Dialects" (1968) is one of the better known.

6. Bailey doesn't say on what she bases this assumption, but it is essentially what Sumner Ives says in his paper "A Theory of Literary Dialect" (1950:145-177).

7. "Basilect" is Stewart's term for language features that are farthest from a prestige norm (Dillard 1972:299). In reference to BEV, the basilect would be its most extreme form, and to a creolist this basilect would be closest to the "hypothetical" historical creole form, what Bailey calls "Proto-Creole".

8. Kenneth Tynan had a critic's way of referring to Miller's whiteness. In reviewing a play version of the novel (a two-day flop co-authored with Robert Rossen), Tynan said that "one was forcibly reminded at every turn of phrase that the authors were not Negroes". (1959:120)
   The past tense reference to Miller is because he died in May of 1966.

9. Dillard gives various examples in his book Black English (1972) of white racists who accurately recorded Black English, not that this point needs defending. The defunct minstrel show tradition must have had its occasional ethnocentric but expertly accurate Black English imitators.

10. Manchild offers a nice comparison and contrast to TCW in that it is a non-fictional and furthermore autobiographical account of a Harlem teenager, written by a black rather than a white person, with both narratives having 1950's settings. Another good novel for comparison is Louise Meriwether's

Daddy Was a Number Runner, this time about a female Harlem teenager, fictional, and written by a black writer.

11. Though Wolfram rightly points out that one particular creolist with his convergence model may see fewer "black-white speech differences" than another particular dialect geographer with his British origins divergence model (1971:140), there nevertheless seems to be a high correlation between the creolist persuasion and the view that sees a greater number of differences. Even Labov, who has done much to point out differences, has a firm respect for the creolists -- despite exhaustively arguing against some of their positions, the Ø-copula especially.

12. These are the main sources in this paper for criticizing the dialect representation of TCW. That even these works leave something to be desired is intimated in Labov's comment that "the definitive work on the grammar of BEV has not yet been done" (1972b:xiv). Grammars never do seem to become "definitive," despite the aspirations of linguists, but we should at least expect further discoveries and revisions. Labov is more to the point in another book where he speaks of the Cumulative Paradox: "the more that is known about a language, the more we can find out about it" (1972a:202).

13. "Exposed position" according to Wolfram (1971:148) is when a form of be occurs in clause final position such as "I know he is" and in tag questions like "He isn't ready, is he?" A seemingly more concise formulation of where be-presence is obligatory and where it is optional in BEV is contained in Labov (1972a:227):

> In general, we find that wherever standard English can contract, BEV can delete the copula, and wherever SE cannot contract, BEV cannot delete. [Emphasis mine.]

Again stating this principle in another of his books, Labov changes his "in general" to "without exception" (1972b:73). Evidently he subsequently became assured that exceptions do not exist.

14. It is interesting to note that contracted forms in Wolfram's Southern rural data are relatively low at 12%, but in Labov's Northern urban data they are considerably higher, 25% for non-pronoun NP subjects and way up to 44% for pronoun subjects. Though these different results are certainly due at least in part to the different speech patterns of these widely separated speech communities, it must also be considered that some of the differences could be due to how each linguist interprets his data on this often difficult to hear feature of contraction. (E.G., consider "It's so nice" vs. "It so nice.") The higher number of contracted forms in Labov's data helps to support his position that be-absence is not Ø-copula but rather a contraction and deletion sequence.

15. Labov also includes data from several other street gang groups. Though figures from the T-Birds were arbitrarily chosen here, the general conclusions on comparison to TCW would be the same, since the patterns repeat "regularly in six different groups" (1972b:86). The figures from "single interview" patterns were also chosen over "group interaction" patterns, to parallel Duke Custis' writing his story without the benefit of peer group interaction. However, once again the general conclusions would be basically the same, since the single interview style only results in "a general increase in the ratio of deletion to contraction", with the basic pattern remaining the same (86).

16. In supporting his argument that be absence in BEV is a phonological process of deleting contracted forms, Labov points out that 'm of I'm is rarely deleted: in general, final nasals are not deleted in BEV. (1972a:228). I am suggesting here (as also in footnote 21) that the linguist's theory

can influence the reading of the data. Dillard, though not denying the pervasive presence of 'm, sees it not as a contraction at all, but as an integral part of I, written therefore without an apostrophe, Im, and interchanging with I. In the following sentence, Dillard says there are no real occurrences of be. Is he calls a question marker and emphasis marker, and Im he calls a variation of I.

Is Im sick?

That am and 'm absence was at least at one time characteristic of black speech is suggested in Botkin. Here are two examples (1945:150), but these occurrences seem rare.

I here to tell you my missus was a dear old soul.
I say, "Mittie, I scared, I scared!"

17. Rules mentioned in this section are taken both from Labov (1972b:Chapter4) and Burling (1973:54-64).

18. Or perhaps, more accurately, the inverted word order of a question is "re-inverted" back to normal word order in standard English question embedding. In BEV, on the other hand, the inverted word order of a question is maintained when embedded. See Labov (1972b:62).

19. Notice that do-support operates in Example Sentence 6, as it does also in some later examples.

20. There are other considerations besides the possibility that embedded yes-no questions in 21 and 8 are in apposition to "question" in a deleted "the answer to my question". 22 is likely formed by a noun phrase complementizing process something like the following abbreviated representation:

I want I know
I want for I to know
I want for to know
I want to know

Therefore, since equi-NP deletion removes the subject noun phrase from the noun phrase complement, the absence of this subject NP in surface structure reduces the possibility of accepting "I know can he go" by analogy with "to know did he go" even though the latter likely has the deep structure "I know he past goes," which if not complementized can in BEV become "I know did he go". A further complication is that the matrix verb in 8 has a negative attached (I don't know can he go), whereas the matrix verb in 21 does not ("I know did he go" if not complementized).

VIII: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, James C.
1964. Artemus Ward. New York. Twayne Publishers, Inc.

Austin, James C.
1965. Petroleum B. Nasby: (David Ross Locke). New York. Twayne Publishers, Inc.

Bailey, Beryl
1953. Creole Languages of the Caribbean. Master's essay, Columbia University (unpublished).

Bailey, Beryl
1962. A Language Guide to Jamaica.

Bailey, Beryl
1965. "Toward a New Perspective in Negro English Dialectology." American Speech, October, 1965, 171-77.

Bailey, Beryl
1968. "Some Aspects of the Impact of Linguistics on Language Teaching in Disadvantaged Communities." Elementary English, 1968 (45), 570-77.

Botkin, B.A., ed.
1945. Lay My Burden Down: A Folk History of Slavery. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Brown, Claude
1965. Manchild in the Promised Land. New York. The New American Library (Signet).

Burling, Robbins
1973. English in Black and White. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Curme, George
1947. English Grammar. New York. Barnes & Noble, Inc.

Dalby, David
1970. "Black through White: Patterns of Communication in Africa and the New World." Black-White Speech Relationships. Wolfram, Walt, and Clarke, Nona, eds. 1971. Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics.

Dillard, J.L.
1972. Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States. New York. Random House, Inc.

Fasold, Ralph, and Wolfram, Walter
1970. "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect." Teaching Standard English in the Inner City. Fasold, Ralph, and Shuy, Roger, eds. 1970. Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics.

Herskovits, Melville
1958. The Myth of the Negro Past. Boston.

Ives, Sumner
1950. "A Theory of Literary Dialect." A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects. Williamson, Juanita, and Burke, Virginia, eds. 1971. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ives, Sumner
1955. "Dialect Differentiation in the Stories of Joel Chandler Harris." A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects. Williamson, Junaita, and Burke, Virginia, eds. 1971. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Kenyon, John S.
1947. "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English." Readings in Applied Linguistics, 2nd edition. Allen, Harold Byron, ed. 1964.

Kochman, Thomas
1969. "Toward an Ethnography of Black American Speech Behavior." Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives. Whitten, Norman, and Szwed, John, eds. 1970. New York. Free Press.

Krapp, George Philip
1925. The English Language in America, Volume I. New York. Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.

Labov, William
1972a. Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, William
1972b. Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, William, and Cohen, Paul
1967? "Some Suggestions for Teaching Standard English to Speakers of Non-Standard Urban Dialects." Mimeographed.

Labov, William; Cohen, Paul; Robins, Clarence; and Lewis, John
1968. A Study of the Nonstandard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City. Vol. I, Phonological And Grammatical Analysis. Vol. II, The Use of Language in the Speech Community. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project No. 3288. Washington, D.C. Office of Education.

McDavid, Raven, and McDavid, Virginia
1951. "The Relationship of the Speech of American Negroes to the Speech of Whites." American Speech. February, 1951.

Meriwether, Louise
1970. Daddy was a Number Runner. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Miller, Warren
1959. The Cool World. Greenwich, Connecticut. Fawcett Publications, Inc.

Miller, Warren
1965. "One Score in Harlem." Saturday Review of Literature, August 28, 1965, p. 49.

Rulon, Curt
1967. "Geographical Delimitation of the Dialect Areas in The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn." A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects. Williamson, Juanita, and Burke, Virginia, eds. 1971. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Stewart, William A.
1967. "Sociolinguistic Factors in the History of American Negro Dialects." The Florida FL Reporter, Spring 1967.

Stockton, Eric
1964. "Poe's Use of Negro Dialect in 'The Gold-Bug.'" A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects. Williamson, Juanita, and Burke, Virginia, eds. 1971. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Sturtevant, E.H.
1947. An Introduction to Linguistic Science. New Haven. Yale University Press.

Turner, Lorenzo Dow
1949. Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Tynan, Kenneth
1959. "The Theatre." New Yorker, March 5, 1959, p. 120.

Wakin, Jeanette
1959. Untitled Interview. Saturday Review of Literature, June 13, 1959, p.18.

Williamson, Juanita
1961. A Phonological and Morphological Study of the Speech of the Negro of Memphis, Tennessee. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan (unpublished).

Williamson, Juanita
1968. The Speech of Negro High School Students in Memphis, Tennessee, Final Report, June 30, 1968. ERIC Microfiche.

Williamson, Juanita
1969. "A Note on It Is/There Is." A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects. Williamson, Juanita, and Burke, Virginia, eds. 1971. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Wolfram, Walt
1971. "Black-White Speech Differences Revisited." Black-White Speech Relationships. Wolfram, Walt, and Clarke, Nona, eds. 1971. Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics.